

DETAILED ACTION

This responds to the Office Communication mailed on June 17, 2009. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1 and 3 have been amended. Claims 1-5, 19-23 are currently pending in the case. No new claims are added. Further examination and reconsideration of the instant application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner states that Claims 1-5 & 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Britt; Margaret et al. [US 6226517 B1] and Slutsman; Lev et al. [US 6058313 A] further in view of Mazzarella; Nick J. et al. [US 6819921 B2].

The present invention, in one embodiment, teaches a central node that receives and executes queries for routing a call and minimizing the call setup delay. The central node of the present invention advantageously contains two tables that contain information for routing the call. A switching unit sends a first query to a central node for information on routing the call. This is unlike Britt, where the switching center (O-MSC) sends a message to NPDB for Location Routing Number (LRN) (Col 3, lines 6-19). It is respectfully pointed that a query is defined by the information that is sent, the information that is to be retrieved and the entity that sends or receives the query. A leap in technology and thought is involved to define the query and the method of triggering by a device not taught in cited art. Merely sending a query for information by the O-MSC of Britt, which is different from the central node and information of the present invention, does not create obviousness. Moreover, Britt does not teach a plurality of tables containing the information for routing the call. Furthermore, Britt teaches sending a message from the O-MSC to HLR (Col. 4, lines 25-43), unlike the present invention, where a second query is sent from a central node to the HLR.

However, purely in the interest of expediting the prosecution of the instant application, Applicant has amended claim 1 to disclose that the second query is triggered if a location routing number is not found in the second table. Britt does not discuss any central node, tables contained

in the central node, or sending a query based on the non-availability of the location routing number in the second table. Therefore, based on the above arguments and amendment made in Claims 1 and 19, the teachings of the present claim are not obvious in view of Britt.

Slutsman teaches sending a query from a switching center to number portability database, unlike the present invention where the query is sent by the central node. As discussed above the central node is different from a switching device and receives the query from a switching device. Moreover, the query from the central node to the number portability database is triggered when the information is not available from the first and second queries. However, Slutsman does not discuss sending a query under any such condition. Furthermore, Slutsman does not teach a number portability database containing information on wireless networks or networks with different technologies. Therefore, based on the above discussion, the teachings of the present invention are not obvious in view of Slutsman.

Mazzarella appears to teach a number portability database containing information on a wireless network, however he does not teach a number portability database containing information on each of the wireless networks. Each service provider in the case of Mazzarella maintains its own database (Col 4, Lines 16-26), unlike the present invention. Furthermore, Mazzarella nowhere teaches that the service providers are operating different wireless technologies. An innovative step is required to maintain a single database with information on different wireless technologies and for various networks. Therefore, the teachings of the present invention are not obvious in view of Mazzarella.

Britt, Slutsman nor Mazzarella teach any central node that is different from a switching center and execute queries or instructions. Moreover, none of these references teach that the central node contains tables having information regarding wireless networks. Furthermore, none of these references teach a single portability database containing information for different wireless technologies. Finally, these references do not teach the combination of limitations of the claims of the present invention. Therefore, the teachings of Britt, Slutsman or Mazzarella taken independently or together do not teach a motivation to create the present invention. Britt, Slutsman or Mazzarella clearly teach away from the present invention and do not make it obvious.

Appl. No. 10/531527
Amdt. dated 08/17/2009
Reply to Office action of 06/17/2009

When determining whether a claim is obvious, an examiner must make “a searching comparison of the claimed invention – including all its limitations – with the teaching of the prior art.” In re Ochiai, 71 F.3d 1565, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (emphasis added). Thus, “obviousness requires a suggestion of all limitations in a claim.” CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Intern. Corp., 349 F.3d 1333, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (citing In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (CCPA 1974)).

Claims 2-5, and 20-23 are dependent on independent claims 1 and 19 respectively and incorporate all their limitations.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant believes that claims 1 and 19 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests they and all claims depending therefrom be passed to allowance.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at any time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 08/17/2009

By: /Raffi Gostanian/

Raffi Gostanian

Reg. No. 42,595

972.849.1310